

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 12 to 27 are pending in the present application. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 12 to 18, 20 to 22, and 24 to 26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 12 to 18, 20 to 22, and 24 to 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,817,896 ("Derenthal"). It is respectfully submitted that Derenthal does not anticipate the present claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 12 relates to a monopole coaxial cable, including, *inter alia*, a core, a dielectric enclosing the core, an electrically conductive shield enclosing the dielectric, a jacket enclosing the shield, and a plug connector including a contact sleeve. Claim 12 recites that a segment of the sleeve is electrically conductively contacting the shield. Claim 12 further recites that an inner surface of the segment is slid onto an outer surface of the dielectric to widen the jacket in a region of the segment. Claim 12 also recites that the sleeve is mechanically connected to the jacket by an extrusion coat of an insulating material, the extrusion coat arranged as a strain relief between the segment and the shield. Claim 17 includes features analogous to those of claim 12.


Derenthal does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claims 12 and 17. For example, Derenthal does not disclose, or even suggest, the feature that a segment of a sleeve is **electrically conductively contacting** a shield. According to the Final Office Action, the lip 28 of the post 36 described by Derenthal constitutes a segment of the sleeve, and the foil/braid/foil 46, 48, 50 constitute a shield. However, nowhere does Derenthal disclose that the lip 28 of the post 36 is **electrically conductive** or that it is **electrically conductively** contacting the foil/braid/foil 46, 48, 50. Rather, electrical contact may be achieved in Derenthal between the foil 50 and the annular collar 14, which is formed of metal, preferably brass. Derenthal, col. 3, lines 5 to 7.

Derenthal is entirely silent as to the material of the post 36 as well as to electrical conductivity of the post 36. The Final Office Action reflects an apparent

appreciation of the absence of any disclosure by Derenthal of the material of the post. In this regard, the Final Office Action alleges at page 6 that “[i]t is clear from fig. 3 that segment 28 of a sleeve 36 contacting a shield and this contact will be conductive **in case the segment is made from conductive material** (emphasis added). Since there is no disclosure by Derenthal that the post 36 is formed of a conductive material, there is consequently no disclosure by Derenthal that a segment of a sleeve is **electrically conductively contacting** a shield.

In addition, Derenthal does not disclose, or even suggest, the feature that an inner surface of a segment is slid onto an outer surface of a dielectric to **widen** a jacket in a region of the segment. As shown in Figure 3 of Derenthal, the jacket 52 has been cut away so that it is not present in the area of the post 36 at all. Thus, the jacket 52 of Derenthal is not even present in a region of the post 36, much less widened in a region of the post 36.

The Final Office Action alleges at page 6 that Figure 3, as modified in the Final Office Action to include reference numeral 52a “shows that element 52a of jacket is present in area of post.”



However, the added reference numeral 52a does not point to a portion of the jacket 52. Rather, the added reference numeral 52a points to a circumferential **gap** or **space** between the second layer of foil 50 and the collar 14. This is readily apparent based on a comparison of Figures 2 and 3 in that Figure 2 is stated to be a cutaway view of the cable connector **before** cable installation and that

Figure 3 is stated to be a cutaway view of the cable connector during cable installation. Figures 2 and 3 of Derenthal are reproduced below:




FIG. 2




FIG. 3

Further, Derenthal does not disclose, or even suggest, the feature that a sleeve is mechanically connected to a jacket by an extrusion coat of an insulating material, the extrusion coat arranged as a strain relief between a segment and a shield. According to the Final Office Action, the locking sleeve 18 constitutes an extrusion coat. However, nowhere does Derenthal disclose that its locking sleeve 18 is an extrusion coat. Instead, Derenthal merely indicates that locking sleeve 18 is a generally cylindrical member formed of rigid material, which is axially moveable from an unlocked position to a locked position. Derenthal, col. 3, lines 21 to 44. Further, as shown in Figure 3 of Derenthal, the locking sleeve 18 is not mechanically connected to the jacket 52. Therefore, Derenthal does not disclose, or even suggest, that a sleeve is mechanically connected to a jacket by an extrusion coat of

an insulating material, the extrusion coat arranged as a strain relief between a segment and a shield.

To anticipate a claim, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif., 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). That is, the prior art must describe the elements arranged as required by the claims. In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). As more fully set forth above, Derenthal plainly fails to disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claims 12 and 17. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Derenthal does not anticipate claims 12 and 17.

As for claims 13 to 16, and 20 to 22, which depend from claim 12 and therefore include all of the features included in claim 12, and claims 18, and 24 to 26, which depend from claim 17 and therefore include all of the features included in claim 17, it is respectfully submitted that Derenthal does not anticipate these dependent claims for at least the same reasons more fully set forth above.

In view of all the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 19, 23, and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 19, 23, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Derenthal and U.S. Patent No. 5,127,853 (“McMills et al.”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Derenthal and McMills et al. does not render unpatentable the presently pending claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 23 depends from claim 12, and claims 19 and 27 depend from claim 17. As more fully set forth above, Derenthal does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claims 12 and 17. McMills et al. also do not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claims 12 and 17 and thus, fail to cure these critical deficiencies.

Moreover, as illustrated, for example, in Figure 3 of McMills et al., the outer shell 58 described by McMills et al. is a pre-formed component assembled with the remainder of the connector. That the outer shell 58 is pre-formed is apparent

from the discussion appearing at, for example, col. 13, lines 28 to 40. Thus, contrary to the assertions included in the Office Action, the outer shell 58 does not constitute an extrusion coat.

In addition, as shown in Figure 1 of McMills et al., a gap or space is present between the outer shell 58 and the outer insulator coating 20, and the outer shell 58 does not make any contact whatsoever with body 26. Thus, the body 26 is not mechanically connected to the outer insulator coating 20 by the outer shell 58. As such, McMills et al. fail to disclose, or even suggest, the feature of a sleeve mechanically connected to a jacket by an extrusion coat of an insulating material.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Derenthal and McMills et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features included in claims 12 and 17, from which claims 19, 23, and 27 depend. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Derenthal and McMills et al. does not render unpatentable claims 19, 23, and 27, which depend from claims 12 and 17.

In view of all of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 4, 2008

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/
Clifford A. Ulrich
Reg. No. 42,194

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646